

As I understood his answer to Delegate Dukes and Delegate James—will you correct me if I did not understand it properly—he ended his comment by saying it may possibly include the right of the legislature to designate the unit within which the collective bargaining should operate, or words to this effect.

Was this substantially what you said?

DELEGATE JAMES: That is substantially what I meant. Certainly you have to accept this word "procedural" in context with the basic right set forth of collective bargaining.

Now, the State certainly could not do anything to impair this right of collective bargaining and this amendment is not in any way intended to do that, but, certainly the manner and means and the procedures through which this collective bargaining process is going to be exercised should be subjected to some state regulation so that it would be meaningful and effective and in the interest of the public and the employees.

That is my intention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have a further question, Delegate Ritter?

DELEGATE RITTER: No, I have no further question.

THE CHAIRMAN: For what purpose does Delegate Sickles rise?

DELEGATE SICKLES: Am I allowed to speak against the amendment?

THE CHAIRMAN: You certainly are.

DELEGATE SICKLES: I feel a little like the time when we were back in the House of Delegates and the committee reported out a bill unfavorably with amendments. We were not really for it, but if it passed, we wanted to be sure it was amended properly.

That is how I feel about this. By putting the word "procedural" in there, it helps the language. I think there is a feeling that what we have done by 21 is a lot broader than I intended or even the sponsors intended that it be, but if that is the intention of some of those maybe it is a better amendment than I thought.

But even in its limitations, it seems to me that it is clearly understood by legislative history which some people question that if you were going to go further that you would have to have legislation to set

up appropriate bargaining units as far as elections are concerned.

If there is concern about legislative history then there should be concern about this legislative history. If a court could read this without having had the benefit of this colloquy, I would be opposed to this amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does anybody desire to speak in favor of the amendment?

Delegate Malkus?

DELEGATE MALKUS: Mr. President, I do not know whether I am speaking in favor or against the amendment. I am disappointed that the President of the Maryland Senate accepted that amendment.

I, too, like Delegate Dukes, do not know what it does. I supported, and in my heart I thought I was right, the Amendment No. 21 which gives people the right to organize.

Since then, I do not know whether I did right or not. And the question that I raised before this body was, does this give the people or organizations or unions the right to strike against the State of Maryland. The amendment is being drawn, and I hope we can talk long enough for the amendment to be prepared that no one can strike against the State of Maryland.

Now, I am very strong in my feeling that people should have the right to organize. My record here in the legislature has always been the same, but I am bitterly opposed to those who struck at the docks when we were getting ready to go overseas to fight for our country, and defy anyone here to say they were right in doing so.

Now, getting back to home, Mr. President, I would be bitterly opposed to anybody who would strike at a state hospital. Before we stop talking, I want it clearly written in this constitution that you cannot strike against the State of Maryland and let some poor inmate die because of some labor dispute we have going.

Now, my friend, brother Sickles, said over here that that cannot be. But I now know that he will support the amendment when I bring it up in a couple of minutes.

Now, this is a serious thing, what we are doing here.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have one-half minute, Delegate Malkus.

DELEGATE MALKUS: Thank you.